

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

On pages 2-4 of the Action, claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fingler et al.

In reply thereto, applicant has canceled claims 1-3 to make a new claim 14 and amended claim 6 to include the features of claim 7, thus defining applicant's invention more clearly over the priory art of record.

As clearly defined in claim 14, applicant's invention comprises a plurality of the plugging cavities (18) provided in the adapter or connector sections (14), one for each section, for receiving the optical cable plugs (25). The plugging cavities extend at an acute angle with a plane of a panel so as to align the optical cable plugs such that the optical cable plugs are plugged in mating optical cable plugs inserted from an opposite direction. That is, each one of the optical cable plugs is provided in each one of the plugging cavities and aligned by the plugging cavity so as to be plugged in a mating optical cable plug (25') inserted in an opposite direction into a mating adapter or connector section (14').

Applicant's invention further comprises a plurality of the partition walls (19) for separating the adapter or connector sections and defining the plugging cavities.

With respect to the prior art, Fingler discloses a wall connector (1), comprising a receptacle plate (5) which is sinusoidal to form upper and lower stages, each stage presenting a pair of downwardly facing surfaces that accommodate a plurality of female receptacles (6) for

receiving optical cable connector (7) (column 3, lines 6-15). That is, the receptacle plate forms four downwardly facing surfaces, each surface having three female receptacles to receive the optical cable connectors.

Firstly, however, Fingler does not disclose or suggest any plugging cavities provided in the adapter or connector sections, one for each section, for receiving the optical cable plugs. If considering that the downwardly facing surfaces are equivalent to applicant's adapter or connector sections, and the female receptacles (6) are equivalent to applicant's plugging cavities, three female receptacles are provided in each surface, while in applicant's invention, only one plugging cavity is provided in each adapter or connector section.

Secondly, Fingler does not disclose or suggest any plugging cavities which extend at an acute angle with the plane of the panel so as to align the optical cable plugs such that the optical cable plugs are plugged in mating optical cable plugs inserted in an opposite direction.

Fingler's female receptacle (6) receives the optical cable connector (7) but does not align the optical cable connector such that it is plugged in a mating optical cable plug. In Fingler, there is no mating optical cable plug in which the optical cable plug is plugged in. Even if a fiber optical cable connector (10) is considered equivalent to the mating optical cable plug, the fiber optical cable connector is not plugged in anything although it is connected to the female receptacle through a fiber optical cable (column 3, lines 21-36).

Thirdly, Fingler does not disclose or suggest any partition wall for separating the adapter or connector sections and defining the plugging cavities.

Fingler's wall separates each pair of downwardly facing surfaces of the upper and lower stages. However, it neither separates the upper and lower stages nor defines the plugging cavities.

As clearly defined in amended claim 6, applicant's invention comprises a pair of the adapter members or connector members (11 and 11') attached to a panel, wherein the pair of adapter or connector members are joined together such that respective front faces thereof abut on each other. Since the respective front faces abut on each other, the respective optical cable plugs inserted in the pair of adapter or connector members are plugged in each other.

However, Fingler does not disclose or suggest such a pair of adapter or connector members. Fingler's pair of downwardly facing surfaces of upper and lower stages do not abut on each other.

For these reasons it is submitted that applicant's invention recited in claims 1-6 is patentable over Fingler et al.

On pages 4-5 of the Action, claims 6-8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ngo.

In reply thereto, applicant hereby submits an English translation of the prior foreign application 2000-269928, which this application is based upon, together with a verification of translation. Since the priority date of the application is September 6, 2000, which precedes the

Application Number: 09/943,000

page 9

Art Unit: 2872

filing date of Ngo or November 29, 2000, it is believed that Ngo is not the prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) any more and claims 6, 8, and 10 are allowable (claim 7 has been canceled).

On page 5 of the Action, claim 9 was objected as being dependent upon the rejected base claim 6 or 7 (claim 7 has been canceled).

In reply thereto, applicant canceled claim 9 and added claim 17 to make an independent claim to combine original claims 6 and 9.

On page 5 of the Action, it was noted that claim 13 is allowable.

Applicant has added claims 15-16 to define applicant's invention more clearly. Claims 15 and 16 recite the split sleeves (12) and the split sleeve receiving cavities (22 and 22'), respectively, which are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

Two-month extension fee is enclosed.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered, claims 4-6, 8, 10, and 14-17 allowed in addition to claim 13, and this case passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,


Satoru Takeuchi

Reg. No. 53,670

Agent for Applicant

Date: 01/06/04

KANESAKA & TAKEUCHI
1423 Powhatan Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel.: (703) 519-9785